## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 20-24 are withdrawn. Claim 1 is amended by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 7, 8, and 16-19 were rejected as anticipated by Wong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,593,541, hereinafter "Wong"); Claims 1, 16, and 17 were rejected as anticipated by <u>Takebayashi</u> (Japanese Patent Publication No. 2002110547); Claims 2-6 were rejected as unpatentable over Wong in view of <u>Tsukatani et al</u>. (U.S. Patent No. 6,576,354, hereinafter "<u>Tsukatani</u>"); Claims 2-6, 18, and 19 were rejected as unpatentable over <u>Takebayashi</u> in view of <u>Tsukatani</u>; Claims 9-15 were rejected as unpatentable over <u>Wong</u>; and Claims 7-15 were rejected as unpatentable over <u>Takebayashi</u>.

Initially, applicants and applicants' representative thank Primary Examiner Xu for the interview held on January 20, 2006 to discuss the present case. During the interview, differences between the claimed invention and the cited references were discussed in detail, and amendments as submitted herein were discussed to clarify the discussed differences. Examiner Xu agreed to reconsider the rejections of record after formal submission of the present amendment.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by Wong, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 recites in part:

a surface anodization layer over only a portion of a surface of the fastener; and a plasma resistant coating over a portion of the surface anodization layer.

In contrast, <u>Wong</u> describes a fastener whose surface is *completely* covered with a corrosion resistant coating.<sup>1</sup> Thus, not only does <u>Wong</u> not teach or suggest "a plasma resistant coating over *a portion* of the surface anodization layer" (where the surface anodization layer covers over only a portion of a surface of the fastener), <u>Wong</u> teaches away from such a feature. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 (and Claims 2-19 dependent therefrom) is not anticipated by <u>Wong</u> and is patentable thereover.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 1 anticipated by <u>Takebayashi</u>, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

<u>Takebayashi</u> describes a fastener with a plasma resistant film 8 thereon. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in <u>Takebayashi</u> for a surface anodization layer anywhere on the fastener. As <u>Takebayashi</u> does not teach or suggest "a surface anodization layer over only a portion of a surface of the fastener," it is respectfully submitted that amended Claim 1 (and Claims 2-19 dependent therefrom) is not anticipated by <u>Takebayashi</u> and is patentable thereover.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 2-6 as unpatentable over <u>Wong</u> in view of <u>Tsukatani</u>, it is noted that Claims 2-6 are dependent from Claim 1, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that <u>Tsukatani</u> does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of <u>Wong</u>. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6 are patentable over <u>Wong</u> in view of <u>Tsukatani</u>.

Further, with regard to the rejection of Claims 2-6, 18, and 19 as unpatentable over <a href="Takebayashi">Takebayashi</a> in view of <a href="Tsukatani">Tsukatani</a>, it is noted that Claims 2-6, 18, and 19 are dependent from Claim 1, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that <a href="Tsukatani">Tsukatani</a> does not cure any of the above-noted

See Wong, column 5, lines 15-19.

Application No. 10/764,456

Reply to Office Action of November 29, 2005

deficiencies of <u>Takebayashi</u>. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 18, and 19 are patentable over Takebayashi in view of Tsukatani.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-19 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) Attorney of Record Registration No. 32,829

Steven P. Weihrouch

**Edward Tracy** 

Registration No. 47,998

I:\ATTY\ET\247394US\247394US-AMD2.28.06.DOC